



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/617,227

07/11/2003

Minoru Hasegawa

1082.1060

2346

21171

7590

03/09/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

HODGES, MATTHEW P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/617,227

Applicant(s)

HASEGAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Matt P. Hodges

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-8, 10-13 and 15-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-8, 10-13 and 15-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/22/2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/22/2005 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on 11/30/2005, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Cancellation of claims 4 and 14 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-13, 15-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Busio et al. (US 2001/0005115 A1).

Regarding claims 1-3, 10, Busio discloses (see figure 1b) a color gas discharge panel including a rear substrate (7), barrier ribs (10), a phosphor layer (R, G, B), a front substrate (1) formed opposite the rear substrate and including in order, electrodes (3 and 4), an organic first

Art Unit: 2879

dielectric layer (5), an inorganic second dielectric layer (33), and a protection layer (6) of MgO. (Paragraph 21). Further the first dielectric layer is polysiloxane including a side chain of alkyl groups. (Paragraphs 0024-0030). The second dielectric layer between the organic dielectric layer and the protection layer is composed of a layer made of ZrO_2 formed to block UV radiation from damaging the first dielectric layer and device. (Paragraph 0032).

Regarding claims 11-13 and 19, Busio discloses the device as claimed (see rejection of claims 1-3 and 10 above). Further the limitation of that “the organic dielectric layer and the inorganic dielectric layer are formed together as a laminate” is drawn to a process of manufacturing which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art by a process limitation. Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product-by-process claim limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113).

Regarding claims 5 and 15, the ZrO_2 layer has a smaller bond distance between an oxygen atom and a Zr atom than the wavelength of an atom vacuum ultra violet ray. (Paragraph 0032).

Regarding claims 6 and 16, the dielectric constant of ZrO_2 (>10) is greater than that of organic dielectric layer.

Regarding claims 7 and 17, Busio further discloses the widths of the first and second dielectric layers being 10 μm and 1 μm respectively. (Paragraphs 0030 and 0032).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. (US 2003/0038599) in view of Busio et al. (US 2001/0005115 A1).

Regarding claims 1-3 and 10, Aoki discloses (see figure 1) a gas discharge panel including a rear substrate (21), barrier ribs (24), a phosphor layer (25), a front substrate (11) formed opposite the rear substrate, electrodes (12 and 13), a first dielectric layer (14), and a protection layer (15) of MgO. (Page 2 paragraph 34). Further the first dielectric layer is polysiloxane including a side chain of alkyl groups. (Page 2 paragraph 44) (Page 3 paragraphs 55 and 62). Aoki does not appear to disclose the use of a second dielectric layer between the organic first dielectric layer and the protection layer, however Busio, in the same field of endeavor, discloses the use of a thin inorganic dielectric layer made of ZrO_2 formed between the protection layer and the first dielectric layer. (Paragraph 0032). This second dielectric layer advantageously prevents degradation of the first dielectric layer by blocking UV radiation. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate an inorganic second dielectric layer as taught by Busio into the gas discharge panel as disclosed by Aoki in order to advantageously prevent degradation of the first dielectric layer by blocking UV radiation.

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claims 11-13 and 19, Aoki in view of Busio discloses the device as claimed (see rejection of claims 1-3 and 10 above). Further the limitation of that “the organic dielectric layer and the inorganic dielectric layer are formed together as a laminate” is drawn to a process of manufacturing which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art by a process limitation. Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product-by-process claim limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113).

Regarding claims 5 and 15, the second dielectric layer of ZrO_2 has a bond distance that is smaller than the wavelength of an atom vacuum ultra violet array.

Regarding claims 6 and 16, the dielectric constant of polysiloxane is less than 3 while the dielectric constant of ZrO_2 is much greater than 10.

Regarding claims 7 and 17, the organic dielectric layer has a thickness of 15 μm (Page 2 paragraph 41) while the inorganic layer is 1 μm (Paragraph 0032).

Regarding claims 8 and 18, the protective layer is 1 μm thick. (Page 7 paragraph 138)

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/30/2005 are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2879

Bechtel et al. (US 6,700,324) discloses the use of a second dielectric layer between the first dielectric layer and the protection layer.

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matt P Hodges whose telephone number is (571) 272-2454. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mph




ASHOK PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER